



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,736	10/09/2001	Michael Brian Bass	A-548A	3570

7590 06/22/2004

Nancy A. Oleski
U. S. Patent Operations/ NAO
AMGEN, INC.
One Amgen Center Drive, Dept. 4300, M/S 27-4-A
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320-1799

EXAMINER

HELMS, LARRY RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/976,736	BASS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Larry R. Helms	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,9,10,14,15 and 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-8,11-13 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, and 16 drawn to SEQ ID NO:1, vectors, host cells and method of producing a polypeptide in Paper filed 4/8/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 14-15, 17-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper filed 4/8/04.
3. Claims 1-3, 608, 11-13, and 16 in part are under examination drawn to SEQ ID NO:1, vectors, host cells and method of expressing SEQ ID NO:1.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The IDS filed 10/09/01 has been placed in the file and all US Patents have been considered. All other references were not in this application or in the parent application. In addition, references CJ to ED do not have any dates associated with the Genbank accession numbers. It is requested that all references not considered be provided and will be considered when the references are provided.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The first line of the specification should indicate that application 09/161,241 is now US Patent 6,344,541.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims encompass non-elected inventions.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 6-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 6-8 and 11-13, as written, do not sufficiently distinguish over vectors and host cells as they exists naturally because claims do not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences between the claimed vectors and host cells and the

Art Unit: 1642

structure of naturally occurring vectors and host cells. The specification contemplates producing transgenic animals with vectors (see page 10) and as such this reads on a transgenic animal. In addition "host cells" reads on the animal from which SEQ ID NO:1 is isolated such as a mouse because the mouse would have SEQ ID NO:1.

In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring antibodies are considered non-statutory subject matter (Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 206 U.S.P.Q. 193 (1980)). It should be noted that the mere purity of a naturally occurring product does not necessarily impart patentability (Ex parte Siddiqui, 156 U.S.P.Q. 426 (1966)). However, when purification results in a new utility, patentability is considered (Merck Co. v. Chase Chemical Co., 273 F.Supp 68 (1967), 155 USPQ 139, (District Court, New Jersey, 1967)). Amendment of the claims to recite "an isolated" or "purified" vector and host cell or similar language would obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an isolated host cell comprising the vector of claims 6-8, does not reasonably provide enablement for just any host cell comprising a vector of claims 6-8. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to

Art Unit: 1642

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). They include the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the amount of direction or guidance disclosed in the specification, the presence or absence of working examples, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation which would be required in order to practice the invention as claimed.

Applicants broadly claim a host cell containing SEQ ID NO:1 and complements. These claims read on a cell within a transgenic animal given that the term "isolated" is not denoted in describing the transgenic cell.

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could not predict the phenotype of transgenics. For example, Overbeek (1994, "Factors affecting transgenic animal production," Transgenic animal technology, pages 96-98) taught that within one litter of transgenic mice, considerable variation in the level of transgene expression occurs between founder animals and causes different phenotypes (page 96, last paragraph). The art of transgenic animals has for many years stated that the unpredictability lies, in part, with the site or sites of transgene integration into the target genome and that "the position effect" as well as unidentified control elements are recognized to cause aberrant expression of a transgene (Wall, 1996 Theriogenology, Vol. 45, pp. 57-68). The elements of the particular construct used to make transgenic

Art Unit: 1642

animals are also held to be critical, and they must be designed case by case without general rules to obtain good expression of a transgene; e.g., specific promoters, presence or absence of introns, etc. (Houdebine, 1994, J. Biotech. Vol. 34, pages 269-287, specifically page 281). Furthermore, transgenic animals are regarded to have within their cells, cellular mechanisms that prevent expression of the transgene, such as methylation or deletion from the genome (Kappell, 1992, Current Opinions in Biotechnology, Vol. 3, pp. 548-553).

Well-regulated transgene expression is not frequently achieved because of poor levels or the complete absence of expression or leaky expression in non-target tissues (Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, pages 253-265, specifically page 256, col. 1 -2, bridg. parag.). Factors influencing low expression, or the lack thereof, are not affected by copy number and such effects are seen in lines of transgenic mice made with the same construct (Cameron, 1997, Molec. Biol. 7, page 256, lines 3-9). With regard to the importance of promoter selection, Niemann (1997) states that transgenic pigs made with different promoters regulating expression of a growth hormone gene give disparate phenotypes - one deleterious to the pig, the other compatible with pig health (Niemann, 1997, Transg. Res. 7, pages 73-75, specifically page 73, col. 2, parag. 2, line 12 to page 73, col. 1, line 4).

Examples in the literature aptly demonstrate that even closely related species carrying the same transgene construct can exhibit widely varying phenotypes. Mullins (1993, Hypertension, Vol. 22, pp. 630-633) states that not all animals express a transgene sufficiently to provide a model for a disease as the integration of a transgene

Art Unit: 1642

into different species of animal has been reported to give divergent phenotypes. For example, several animal models of human diseases have relied on transgenic rats when the development of mouse models was not feasible. Mullins (1990, *Nature*, Vol. 344, 541-544) produced outbred Sprague-Dawley x WKY rats with hypertension caused by expression of a mouse *Ren-2* renin transgene. Hammer (1990, *Cell*, Vol. 63, 1099-1112) describes spontaneous inflammatory disease in inbred Fischer and Lewis rats expressing human class I major histocompatibility allele HLA-B27 and human β_2 -microglobulin transgenes. Both investigations were preceded by the failure to develop human disease-like symptoms in transgenic mice expressing the same transgenes that successfully caused the desired symptoms in transgenic rats (Mullins, 1989, *EMBO J.*, vol. 8, pages 4065-4072; Taurog, 1988, *Jour. Immunol.*, Vol. 141, pages 4020-4023). Mullins (1996, *J. Clin. Invest.* Vol. 98, pages S37-S40) disclose that the use of nonmurine species for transgenesis will continue to reflect the suitability of a particular species for the specific questions being addressed, bearing in mind that a given construct may react very differently from one species to another. Thus, at the time of filing, the phenotype of a transgenic cell contained within any animal was unpredictable and could not be prepared for any species. Applicants can obviate the instant rejection by amending the claims to recite the term "isolated" before the recitation, "transgenic cell".

Art Unit: 1642

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McCarthy (US Patent Application Publication US 2003/0068312, with priority to 1/15/98).

The claims recite an isolated nucleic acid encoding a biologically active DKR polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:1 and complements and nucleic acids comprising SEQ ID NO:1 and vectors and host cells comprising the nucleic acid and vectors and a method of producing the polypeptide by expressing SEQ ID NO:1.

McCarthy teach the exact sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 (See SEQ ID NO:16) and the nucleic acid can be in a vector and host cells and a method of producing such (see page 13, paragraph 0091, page 25, paragraph 0167 and SEQ ID NO:16 is intended to be within the scope of the invention). Since SEQ ID NO:16 is disclosed it would be inherent that the complement is in the possession and also it would be inherent that if SEQ ID NO:16 is in a vector and host cell its complement is also. It is also inherent that since SEQ ID NO:16 is identical to SEQ ID NO:1 and encoded the exact protein, the protein encoded by SEQ ID NO:16 would be a biologically active DKR polypeptide.

Art Unit: 1642

Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01.

Atlas Powder Co. V. IRECO, 51 USPQ2d 1943 (Fed. Cir. 1999)

Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art... However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. The Court further held that this same reasoning holds true when it is not a property but an ingredient which is inherently contained in the prior art.

Conclusion

13. No claim is allowed.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry R. Helms, Ph.D, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0832. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from ⁶³⁰~~7:00~~ am to ^{4:00}~~4:30~~ pm, with alternate Fridays off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at (571) 272-0841.

15. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette,

Application/Control Number: 09/976,736

Page 10


Art Unit: 1642

1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center telephone number is 703-872-9306.

Respectfully,

Larry R. Helms Ph.D.

571-272-0832



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER